

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 14 2006

REMARKS

The office action fails to make out a *prima facie* rejection since there is a total absence of any teaching of a rationale to combine. The total analysis is as follows:

Given the teachings of the references, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of Hallock et al. choosing to drive the patterned/substrate post development over Verhaverbeke with reasonable expectation of achieving a pattern having reduced line edge roughness.

Of course, the requirement to show a rationale to combine demands that the *prima facie* rejection explain why it would be obvious to combine and explain why based on some teaching from the reference. There simply is no reason to combine Verhaverbeke with Hallock. Verhaverbeke has nothing to do with a photoresist. Moreover, Verhaverbeke dries off the material that he treats via his treatment process. One would never expect, if all he did was dry, that Verhaverbeke would have some affect on line edge roughness, conclusory assertions to the contrary in the office action notwithstanding.


Thus, there is simply no reason to combine the two references together. Verhaverbeke has nothing to do with photoresists and could not possibly teach anyone anything about line edge roughness. Since his aim is to dry out the material he is treating, it is hard to see how one would think that his process could have any subsequent effect on line edge roughness.

Since it is conceded that Hallock fails to teach the use of the supercritical fluid after development, and there is no rationale to modify Hallock with Verhaverbeke in the way claimed, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 14, 2006


Timothy M. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]
Attorneys for Intel Corporation